

Item: Senate Minutes, June 2002
Call Number: Senate fonds, UA-5

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for June 2002. The documents have been ordered chronologically and made OCR for ease of searching. The original documents and additional documents for this year which have not yet been digitized can be found in the Dalhousie University Senate fonds (UA-5) at the Dalhousie University Archives and Special Collections.

The original materials and additional materials which have not been digitized can be found in the Dalhousie University Archives and Special Collections using the call number referenced above.

In most cases, copyright is held by Dalhousie University. Some materials may be in the public domain or have copyright held by another party. It is your responsibility to ensure that you use all library materials in accordance with the Copyright Act of Canada. Please contact the Copyright Office if you have questions about copyright, fair dealing, and the public domain.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

APPROVED MINUTES

OF

SENATE MEETING

SENATE met in regular session on Monday, June 24, 2002, at 4:00 p.m., in University Hall, MacDonald Building.

Present with Mr. Fraser in the chair were the following:

N. Ben-Abdallah, M. Bradfield, C. Breckenridge, R. Caldwell, W. Caley, A. Cochrane, G. Coffin, S. Coughlan, D. Cunningham, G. Elder, T. Emodi, D. Farrell, J. Galarneau, S. Guppy, A. Jalilvand, J. Kwak, W. Lahey, K. Loudon, B. MacDonald, N. MacDonald, W. MacInnis, J. Macrae, C. McGrath, L. McIntyre, H. Morgan, P. Neumann, O. Rajora, R. Rowe, P. Saunders, C. Savoy, D. Schroeder, D. Scott, D. Sommerfeld, D. Tindall, T. Traves, R. Whyte.

Regrets: D. Alexander, M. Binkley, R. Bleasdale, J. Connolly, S-J. Corke, B. Downe-Wamboldt, D. Egan, M. El-Hawary, R. Huebert, J. Lawen, R. MacGregor, W. Maes, E. Milios, K. Neves, W. Phillips, B. Rheault, C. Sastri, S. Scully, C. Starnes, I. Ugursal, S. Workman.

Invitees: Mr. D. Blaikie, Mr. B. Crocker, Mr. R. Hoffman, Mr. A. Sedgwick, Ms. F. Woodman

2002:055.

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as circulated.

2002:056.

Minutes of Previous Meetings

The minutes of the meeting of May 16, 2002 were adopted as circulated.

2002:057.

Changes to the Graduation List

Mr. Fraser reported that, in accordance with Senate procedures, the following names had been added to the graduation list for the May convocations:

Bachelor of Arts: Amy Barrett, James Deacon, Marina DeMello, Keith William Vass, Peter Whitby.

Bachelor of Commerce: Trevor MacRae.

Bachelor of Engineering: Carol Ann Ding.

Bachelor of Science: Pamela Burbick, Jason Gray, Reem Hamad, Sheri Johnson, Shamin Rahemtulla.

Diploma in Health Services Administration: Tina Bunch.

These students had met all of the requirements for the degree or diploma indicated, but had not been included on the list of graduands approved at the May 16, 2002 meeting. The most frequent reasons for students' omission from the original list was the late submission of a grade—frequently for a class taken at another university.

2002:058.

Chair's Remarks

Mr. Fraser welcomed two new Senators: Dennis Farrell, Department of Music, and Jim McNiven, School of Public Administration.

2002:059.

Question Period

Mr. Bradfield indicated that in a previous question, he had noted that the donors' wall in the new Marion McCain Arts and Social Sciences Building did not recognize the contribution toward the cost of the building which was made by the university pension fund. Subsequent to his original question, it had been reported to the Board of Governors' Operations Committee that the pension fund had contributed in excess of \$5 million, yet as far as he was aware, there was still no recognition of that contribution on the donors' wall. Further, in addition to the \$5 million from the pension fund, 20 donors were listed as having each contributed at least \$1 million. Since the cost of the building was \$21.5 million, he sought an explanation for this discrepancy.

Mr. Traves responded that he understood that the donors' wall recognized not only contributions to the Marion McCain Building, but contributions to the university's capital campaign over a five-year period.

In a subsequent question, Mr. Bradfield asked that Senate be provided with information on the total amount of the pension fund savings, and how these were used by the university administration.

2002:060.

Nominations from the Senate Nominating Committee

Mr. Fraser welcomed Ms. Woodman, Chair of the Senate Nominating Committee. Ms. Woodman presented the nominations for the position of Secretary of Senate, and for membership on Senate Committees. On behalf of the Senate Nominating Committee, Mr. Fraser moved:

THAT Denise Sommerfeld, Faculty of Health Professions, be elected to serve as the Secretary of Senate, for the term July 1, 2002, to June 30, 2005.

After the requisite three calls for further nominations, the motion was CARRIED.

On behalf of the Senate Nominating Committee, Mr. Fraser moved:

THAT the people listed in Ms. Woodman's June 17, 2002, memorandum to the Secretary of Senate, distributed with the meeting agenda, and those listed in her June 18, 2002, memo, distributed by e-mail to Senators on June 19, 2002, be elected to serve on the designated committees.

Ms. McIntyre noted that Patricia Manuel, nominated to serve on the Senate Committee on Learning and Teaching, was identified as being from the Faculty of Architecture and Planning, but actually was jointly appointed to that Faculty and to the Faculty of Health Professions.

After the requisite three calls for further nominations, the motion was CARRIED.

On behalf of Senate, Mr. Fraser extended congratulations to Ms. Sommerfeld and to all elected to Senate Committees, and conveyed thanks to Ms. Woodman and members of the Nominating Committee for their extensive work in assisting Senate in filling approximately 50 positions on its various committees.

2002:061.

Annual Reports to Senate

- a) Nova Scotia Agriculture College Report: 2000/01

Mr. Fraser invited Mr. Coffin, Principal of the Nova Scotia Agricultural College, to present the College's Annual Report.

Mr. Coffin indicated that NSAC was very pleased with its association agreement with Dalhousie, and moved:

That the Nova Scotia Agricultural College Annual Report for 2000-2001 be received.

Ms. Guppy enquired about the strategic planning process which was intended to occur in 2001-2002. Mr. Coffin responded that the process was nearing completion, the report *Looking Outward—Embracing Change* was being printed, and follow-up plans were being developed.

The motion was CARRIED.

b) Senate Discipline Committee Report: 2001-2002

Mr. Fraser invited Mr. Blaikie, Chair of the Senate Discipline Committee to present the report. Mr. Blaikie indicated that this had been a busy year for the Committee which dealt with 109 cases—double the number of cases dealt with three years earlier. The majority of cases involved plagiarism. Since the Senate Discipline Committee believed that many of the potential responses to this problem lay outside its mandate, the committee was recommending the formation of an *ad hoc* committee of Senate to make recommendations on how best to address the problem of plagiarism. The committee also was recommending an expansion of its membership to enable it to deal with the increased workload.

On behalf of the Senate Discipline Committee, Mr. Fraser **moved:**

THAT the Senate Discipline Committee Report for 2001-2002 be received.

Ms. McIntyre recalled that when the 2000-2001 Discipline Committee Report was presented, there was discussion of an automatic failure in a course being imposed as a standard penalty in cases of plagiarism. In the 2001-2002 Report, she noted that this penalty was applied in half of the cases, but other penalties were applied in the other cases.

Mr. Blaikie responded that it had not been the committee's understanding that a uniform penalty would be applied in all cases. While the committee considered the failing grade to be the usual penalty in a case of plagiarism, the panels established by the committee to hear individual cases had the discretion to take into consideration mitigating factors, and to assign a penalty accordingly.

The motion was CARRIED.

On behalf of the Senate Discipline Committee, Mr. Fraser moved:

THAT a Committee of Senate be struck to assess and evaluate the University's current approach to the problem of plagiarism and to make recommendations to Senate on how best to address the problem. It is recommended that this be a five-person Committee, with members to include a Co-Chair of the Senate Discipline Committee; Ms. Fran Nowakowski, of the Killam Library; a student active in discipline matters nominated by the Dalhousie Student Union; a person nominated by the Senate Committee on Learning and Teaching (SCOLT); and a person nominated by the Senate Computing Information and Technology Planning Committee (SCITPC). This Committee should be required to submit a written report to Senate by March 10th, 2003.

Ms. McIntyre reported that the Faculty of Health Professions also has established a committee to examine the problem of plagiarism, and one of the issues the committee would be examining was how best to support faculty members in bringing forward cases of plagiarism. Ms. McIntyre suggested that Terms of Reference for the proposed Senate Committee be brought to Senate for its consideration, and that the committee should be expanded to include at least one faculty member who has had experience putting cases forward to the Senate Discipline Committee.

Ms. McIntyre moved an amendment:

That Senate Steering Committee prepare, and present to Senate for its consideration, proposed Terms of Reference for the committee, including an expansion of the committee's membership to include at least one faculty member who has had experience presenting a case of alleged plagiarism to the Senate Discipline Committee.

The amendment was CARRIED.

The amended motion was CARRIED.

On behalf of the Senate Discipline Committee, Mr. Fraser moved:

THAT the number of faculty members who serve on the Committee be increased to 12 (from 10) with one of the two new faculty positions to be filled by someone with a legal education, and that the number of student members be increased to 7 (from 5) with one of the two new student positions to be filled by the graduate student appointed to Senate.

Mr. Coughlan recalled that the Senate Discipline Committee's 2000-2001 Report also recommended an increase in membership, and that Senate had supported that recommendation by expanding the committee. At that time, he had proposed that the committee consider reducing the size of its panels from five members to three: two faculty members and one student. He wondered if the committee had discussed this option as an alternative to increasing the committee size.

Mr. Blaikie indicated that reducing the size of panels had not been discussed by the committee, but that he could present this option to it for its consideration.

Mr. McGrath commented that he would be concerned that reducing the size of panels would make it more difficult to achieve consistency across cases. Mr. Coughlan responded that increasing the committee size would also make it more difficult to achieve consistency, so that consistency was a concern with either proposed approach.

Ms. McIntyre supported the proposal for 3-person hearing panels. She believed that such an arrangement, in addition to reducing the number of cases each member of the Committee would be expected to hear, also would increase the onus on individuals to be fully familiar with all details of each case they were considering.

Mr. Whyte moved:

THAT the motion be referred back to the Senate Discipline Committee for further consideration.

Mr. McGrath and Ms. Galarneau expressed concern that failure to pass the motion at this time would result in a delay in addressing the Senate Discipline Committee workload and make it difficult to provide a sufficient number of students to hear cases over the summer months.

The motion to refer was CARRIED.

In discussion, it was clarified that the committee might wish to return with the same recommendation—to expand the size of the committee—or with an alternative recommendation. It was suggested that the committee might wish to meet early in the Fall to consider this matter, so that action could be taken early in the 2002-2003 academic year.

Mr. Fraser thanked Mr. Blaikie and the members of the Senate Discipline Committee for their service over the past year.

c) Senate Physical Planning Committee Report: 2001-2002

Mr. Bradfield, Secretary of the Senate Physical Planning Committee, moved:

THAT the Senate Physical Planning Committee Report for 2001-2002 be received.

The motion was CARRIED.

d) Senate Computing and Information Technology Planning Committee (SCITPC) Reports: 2000-2001 and 2001-2002

Mr. Fraser invited Mr. Sedgwick, current Chair of SCITPC, and Mr. Hoffman, incoming Chair of the Committee, to present the committee's reports.

On behalf of SCITPC, Mr. Fraser moved:

THAT the Senate Computing and Information Technology Planning Committee Reports for 2000-2001 and for 2001-2002 be received.

Mr. Bradfield noted the reference to "inappropriate glass-bead projection screens in the McCain building" in the 2001-2002 Report. He indicated that this item had not been drawn to the attention of the Senate Physical Planning Committee and wondered if the screens had been replaced, and if so, at what cost.

Mr. Sedgwick responded that to the best of his knowledge no screens were replaced, although there had been some dissatisfaction with the particular screens which had been selected for the McCain building.

The motion was CARRIED.

On behalf of SCITPC, Mr. Fraser moved:

THAT in an effort to provide an Information Technology mechanism to help in the effort to stem plagiarism, the University Computing and Information Services should subscribe to a service such as TurnItIn.com on an institutional level. Further, the Academic Computing Services should develop, in conjunction with the University librarians, a training program on the use of the service, and the Help Desk should also act as a resource to assist instructors in using the service.

Ms. MacRae asked if TurnItIn.com subscribed to electronic journals, or if it was limited to student papers. Mr. Hoffman responded that TurnItIn.com currently does not have access to electronic journals, but he understood that it was in negotiation to attempt to acquire such rights. It appeared, however, to have the largest database of submitted papers, as well as having access to collections of papers on the Internet.

Mr. Traves suggested that since this undoubtedly would be one of the issues which the new committee on plagiarism would want to examine, it might be more appropriate to refer this motion to that committee, once established. Mr. Hoffman responded that the recommendation arose in response to the 2000-2001 Report of the Senate Discipline Committee. SCITPC had investigated the options and, on the basis of that investigation, made the current recommendation. If the matter was referred to the new committee on plagiarism, it would mean that no action would be likely for another year.

Ms. Galarneau enquired about the cost of the service. Mr. Hoffman indicated that a final price was not known as there had not yet been any formal negotiations, but the total cost was expected to be under \$10,000 Canadian per year.

Ms. Sommerfeld indicated that an article she had read concerning services such as TurnItIn.com raised concerns about ownership issues, since papers submitted to such services frequently become the property of the service. She wondered if ownership issues had been discussed within the committee. Mr. Hoffman responded that the committee had discussed this extensively. Papers which are submitted to TurnItIn.com become part of their database, but are not published or used in any way other than for "originality checking." The committee also consulted with Brain Crocker, the University Counsel, who indicated that he saw no legal impediments to using TurnItIn.com, since the university would be using the service simply to check the originality of work.

Ms. Macrae indicated that since she expected that the committee on plagiarism would be formed early in the Fall term, she saw no problem with referring this recommendation to that committee.

Mr. Traves noted that the motion specified that the university should subscribe to a service *such as* TurnItIn.com, and wondered if the committee intended this as a firm recommendation for this particular service, or a recommendation that this type of service be secured, with further investigation being required to evaluate specific service providers. Mr. Hoffman indicated that it was the committee's intent that the university subscribe to TurnItIn.com now, but the motion was worded in such a way as to allow the university to change service providers in the future if it were determined that a different provider could more appropriately meet the university's needs. Indeed, it was the committee's view that there was nothing preventing individual faculty members from using TurnItIn.com now, but since they could only use it five times before they had to pay for the service, the committee believed that it was important to provide the service on an institutional basis, so that there was equity in access across the university.

Ms. Macrae moved:

THAT the motion be referred to the committee which is to be formed to make recommendations concerning the problem of plagiarism.

Mr. Saunders indicated that he did not see any conflict between adopting the recommendation of the committee at present, and also referring the matter to the new committee once it was formed. Since the motion would not commit the university permanently to a particular service, it would be entirely possible for the new committee to reconsider the specific service to be used. In addition, there was a certain split in function: the present motion should assist the university in identifying instances of plagiarism immediately, while the committee may wish to focus somewhat more on policy issues, such as determining the appropriate action to take when plagiarism is identified.

The motion to refer was DEFEATED.

The main motion was CARRIED.

On behalf of SCITPC, Mr. Fraser moved:

THAT the Senate adopt a policy affirming that any instructor may require student papers to be submitted in both written form and computer-readable form (e.g., a text file on floppy disk) defined by the instructor, which the instructor may submit to computer-based assessment system(s) for the purpose of assessing the originality of the paper. Such assessment may be used as evidence in any disciplinary action taken by the Senate. And the Senate should advertise this policy through statements in the *University Calendar* and elsewhere, as appropriate.

Mr. Hoffman indicated that in proposing this motion, the committee was affirming a right which it believed faculty members already possessed. In addition, based on the experience of those who have used TurnItIn.com, it appeared that simply publicizing the fact that faculty have access to this tool, in itself, inhibits plagiarism.

Mr. McGrath asked whether there was any concern over intellectual property issues, since he assumed that papers submitted became the property of TurnItIn.com. Mr. Sedgwick responded that it was clear that the intellectual property rights remained with the author. In many cases, papers might be submitted to TurnItIn.com directly by students.

Mr. Morgan indicated that he failed to see why any student who knew they had produced original work would wish to submit a paper to TurnItIn.com, and then have the paper become part of that service's database. Mr. Whyte echoed the concern. The only students he could imagine who would want to submit papers to the service were ones who were guilty of plagiarism, and wanted to find out if they were going to get caught. Mr. Hoffman responded that the committee viewed Dalhousie's use of the service as being primarily a resource for faculty who want to check the originality of papers, but could not hope to do so manually, especially for large classes. Mr. Traves pointed out that the motion did not comment on the issue of who would submit material to TurnItIn.com, but rather affirmed that faculty could require the submission of papers in computer-readable form, and made provision for the university to publicize this fact.

Mr. Saunders suggested that it should be understood that any particular computer-readable format required by faculty should be reasonably accessible to students, and also that the existing policies on accommodation for students with disabilities would continue to apply.

Ms. Sommerfeld commented that she saw plagiarism as a symptom of a larger problem—that many students do not know how to write well. She wondered how the issue of plagiarism could be connected with concerns of the Senate Committee on Learning and Teaching, for example, and with concerns of Librarians, whose resources are already stretched to the limit. Ultimately, an appropriate response to plagiarism would need to be comprehensive.

The motion was CARRIED.

2002:062.

Conflict of Interest Policy

On behalf of Senate Steering Committee, Mr. Fraser moved:

THAT the Senate adopts the Conflict of Interest Policy (May 7, 2002 draft) to the extent that it affects academic matters within the purview of Senate.

Mr. Fraser welcomed Mr. Crocker, University Counsel, and indicated that both Mr. Traves and Mr. Crocker were available to address questions or concerns of Senators. Mr. Fraser also noted that, in keeping with past practice, non-Senators who wished to speak to the motion, would be given an opportunity to do so provided there was no objection, and no Senator was waiting to speak.

Mr. Bradfield observed that the proposed policy was to have been widely discussed across campus. Within that context, he asked Mr. Crocker how many Faculties he visited, and how those discussions affected the current draft policy. Mr. Crocker responded that he was invited to attend one meeting in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. There was very good discussion, which resulted in some changes to the proposed policy. An invitation was also given for

individuals to submit comments or proposed changes directly to him. Some individuals did so, and some of those suggestions were incorporated into the proposed policy.

Mr. Faulkner addressed Senate as one of the parties who negotiated an agreement to a grievance which had gone to arbitration. One of the items on which the parties had agreed was that the Conflict of Interest Policy would not be adopted by the Board of Governors until there had been widespread discussion of it across campus, and Senate had been able to offer its advice. Mr. Faulkner believed that, for a variety of reasons, there had not yet been wide discussion of the proposed policy. He thus proposed that such discussion take place in September, with Senate voting on the proposed policy in October.

Mr. Whyte reported that the proposed policy had been widely circulated within the Faculty of Medicine and had been considered by the Faculty Council.

Mr. Tindall noted that in the Minutes of the May 16th Senate meeting, the President indicated that the proposed policy would be going to the June meeting of the Board of Governors for decision, and wondered if that meeting had already taken place. Mr. Traves indicated that the Board meeting was to occur the following day.

Ms. McIntyre reported that in the Faculty of Health Professions, the proposed policy has been on the agenda of Faculty Council meetings as part of the Senate report. Members of the Faculty were urged to raise questions or concerns. Reference to it also was included in a letter to all faculty concerning Annual Report changes, indicating that once the policy was approved, faculty would be asked for conflict of interest disclosures as part of their Annual Reports. She believes there had not been a greater response to the call for feedback because most members of the university community saw this as a sensible policy.

Mr. McGrath noted that the draft policy had been on the Senate website for several months, along with an invitation to comment, and the issue of developing a Conflict of Interest Policy had been under discussion for more than a decade. Since the university currently has no Conflict of Interest Policy, and since the proposed policy accommodates most of the needs of the community, he favoured adopting the policy and considering amendments in the future, if necessary.

Mr. Stuttard confirmed that adopting a conflict of interest policy had been under consideration even before he commenced his first term as Chair of Senate in 1995. Although the university needed a conflict of interest policy, he believed that the proposed policy should not be adopted as it provided a corporate model rather than a university model based on collegial self-governance. In addition, he opposes the ambiguity in the motion introduced by the reference to "academic matters within the purview of Senate."

Mr. Traves indicated that the Senate Steering Committee had proposed the present wording following the discussion at the last meeting, in an attempt to focus on the proposed policy itself, rather than on a lengthy examination of the role and jurisdiction of Senate in the governance of the university. Mr. Traves reminded members that the proposed policy applied to all members of the university community, not just to faculty. Members of the university community need to have clear policies and procedures to guide their actions, and to provide them with appropriate

protection. The proposed policy had been circulated for several months. The discussion of the policy had been as widespread as members of the university community have cared to make it. Mr. Traves urged members to adopt the proposed policy.

Mr. Neumann raised a concern about whether conflicts should be handled through Deans, or whether there should be university-wide committees. A faculty member, for example, might bring a conflict of interest to a Dean, who might sanction the action because there was a benefit to the Faculty. Mr. Crocker pointed out that the policy addresses situations where there is a conflict between the personal interest of an individual when that individual is also asked to make a decision or take an action on behalf of the university. It is not, however, a policy designed to deal with all conflicts. While it is always possible for there to be errors of judgement, the decisions of Deans and others made under the policy would be subject to review, and would be reported, in summary form, to Senate on an annual basis.

Mr. Neumann expressed concern about decisions being made in the interest of individual Faculties rather than in the interest of the university. Mr. Crocker responded that Deans and others making decisions under the policy would be encouraged to seek advice, and to consult with others.

Mr. Bradfield moved:

THAT consideration of the motion be postponed until it has been discussed in all Faculties and comments from each Faculty had been received by Senate.

Mr. McGrath enquired as to who would speak on behalf of each Faculty. Mr. Bradfield responded that he assumed that the minutes of a Faculty meeting would contain a report of the discussion, and that these would then be reviewed by a Senate Committee.

Mr. Traves indicated that he would not support the motion since the proposed policy had been widely circulated within the university over a period of several months, and he was doubtful that additional time would add clarity. In addition, he questioned whether Senate would want to place itself in a position where it could not bring the proposed policy back for consideration if a single Faculty, for whatever reason, chose not to provide its comments to Senate.

Mr. McGrath asked the President if he believed the Board of Governors would consider the proposed policy at its meeting the following day, if the motion to postpone consideration was adopted and Senate thus did not provide any recommendation at this time. Mr. Traves responded that he could not anticipate the action of the Board of Governors and he felt that it would be inappropriate for him to speculate.

Mr. Bradfield pointed out that Senate had not received, directly, the feedback from members of the university community, but rather had received only revisions to the draft policy, which took into account only some of the comments. He believed that there were substantive issues, such as the proposal for peer review of conflicts of interest, which deserved wider discussion before Senate considered the proposed Conflict of Interest Policy.

The motion to postpone was DEFEATED.

Mr. Bradfield asked for clarification from the President that the proposed policy applied to members of the Board of Governors. Mr. Traves indicated that it did.

Mr. Scott, referring to the provision for representatives of the Board of Governors to meet with a like committee from the Senate, asked if the proposed policy had been considered by such a body. The Chair clarified that there is a statutory provision for an annual meeting of six representatives of Senate and six representatives of the Board of Governors. These meetings have been held each year. They provide a forum for open discussion of issues of mutual interest, but they do not have a decision-making role.

Mr. Tindall asked for clarification concerning the application of the proposed Conflict of Interest Policy to members of the Board of Governors, noting that the proposed policy indicated that it did not apply to members of the Board while they were attending Board meetings. Mr. Traves responded that in 1988 the Board of Governors adopted a Conflict of Interest Policy for its members which provided that whenever a conflict of interest arises for a Board member at a meeting of the Board or one of its committees, the Board member is to declare the conflict and withdraw from the decision(s) which are about to be taken. When there are other instances in which Board members are acting on behalf of the university, the proposed university Conflict of Interest Policy would apply.

Ms. Macrae requested that the Chair check to see if a quorum was still present. After a count of those members present, the Chair confirmed that the meeting had maintained its quorum.

The motion was CARRIED.

2002:063.

Appointment of Ombudsperson and Assistant Ombudsperson

In accordance with the recommendation of the Ombudsperson Advisory Committee, provided in the letter from Mr. McKee, Vice-President, Student Services, Ms. Galarneau moved:

THAT Ms. Dahlia Bateman be appointed Ombudsperson and Ms. Candace Smith be appointed Assistant Ombudsperson.

The motion was CARRIED.

2002:064.

President's Report

Mr. Traves reported that since Senate had considered the report of the Budget Advisory Committee, there has been a change in the interest rate policy resulted in an increase in projected revenue of \$650,000. It had been decided to allocate the entire sum to offset a portion of the across-the-board cuts to Faculties, reducing the cut from 3.35% to 2.7%.

Mr. Traves reported on the results of the distribution of what had become known as the Indirect Research Costs Grant which the university received. Dalhousie received an allocation from the federal government of \$5,289,000 as compensation for past expenditures on the indirect costs of

research. A call for proposals was issued to Faculties; these were considered by the Vice-Presidents and the President with the following allocation:

- \$1.15 million to the Killam Library for the Learning Commons
- \$300,000 to the Office of Research Services for seed money for research proposals and contracts
- \$241,000 to assist NU-TECH in the cost of commercializing research
- \$125,000 toward the costs of a Regional Data Centre in cooperation with Statistics Canada—to be located at the Killam Library
- \$100,000 to purchase additional monographs in Arts and Social Sciences
- \$1 million general allocation to the Faculty of Medicine
- \$1 million general allocation to the Faculty of Science
- \$150,000 general allocation to the Faculty of Health Professions
- \$322,000 to the university-affiliated hospitals
- \$900,000 to the Faculty of Engineering to renovate Building N

Mr. Traves also reported that the university had received a preliminary indication of an allocation from the Atlantic Innovations Fund (AIF). The timing of the announcements are determined by the federal government. When all of the projects being funded, not only by AIF but also by the related grants from CFI and in some cases from the Nova Scotia Research and Innovation Trust, the net total of projects that will be supported at Dalhousie will be in excess of \$40 million. As a result, there will be a very substantial increase in funds which be available on campus for research equipment and projects.

2002:065.

Other Business

On behalf of Senate, Mr. Fraser expressed deep appreciation to Ruth Bleasdale for her dedication and untiring service as Secretary of Senate over the past six years. As Ms. Bleasdale recently had been ill, and thus was not able to attend the meeting, a presentation would be made to her privately.

Mr. Fraser also thanked the following Senators who were completing their terms and retiring from Senate: David Alexander, Ruth Bleasdale, Michael Bradfield, David Egan, Geoffrey Elder, Rajendra Gupta, Joseph Lawen, Evangelos Milios, Ian Mobbs, Hubert Morgan, Chelluri Sastri, and Carolyn Savoy.

2002:066.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

